UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,)	Case No. CR 15-575 W170
Plaintiff,) v.)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ETD
Defendant.	MAR 18 2016
Defendant.)	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
Defendant. Defend	
Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	
The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).	
Failure to grant a continuance would deny the daking into account the exercise of due diligence	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 3 19 16	JOSEPH C. SPERO
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Chief Magistrate Judge Assistant United States Attorney October 16 R. October 18 R.